Serial No. 09/837,298 Reply to Office Action of <u>March 26, 2004</u>

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-6, 11, 13-14, 17, and 19-20 are amended as well as the specification, page 4, 8, 9, and 11. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kakutani (U.S. Patent No. 6,320,950).

Claim 1 recites, in particular, "a method for identifying a calling party number of a switching... storing the terminated calling party number of an origination subscriber if the termination subscriber has registered for the calling party number call-back service..." Kakutani does not teach or suggest this operation.

Kakutani discloses a communication control unit in the called station, which identifies caller's telephone number. This communication control unit includes, in particular, a Ram 6 to hold information such as caller ID temporarily, a caller ID receiving/processing section 9 to detect an origination number, and a display section 10 to display contents of caller ID. In order to detect the originator's number, Kakutani teaches that a caller ID receiving/processing section is included. In Kakutani's operation, he discloses that when an incoming signal detected by a caller ID receiving/processing section 9 does not include a caller ID with originator number information, a normal arrival response processing is conducted. The normal arrival response

Serial No. 09/837,298

Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2004

processing is if an arrival signal is detected within a predetermined time period, communication is processed. Otherwise, the communication is disconnected and returns to the idle state. In case that the signal includes the originator number information, the originator's number is temporarily stored in the RAM. Then, the signal is transferred to an appropriate called response mode setting, such as free dial mode, collect call mode, and normal mode.

Therefore, Kakutani teaches a temporary storage procedure of originator number information in the communication control system of the called station. However, he does not teach or suggest storing the terminated calling party number if the termination subscriber has registered for the calling party number call-back service. Rather, Kakutani suggests that all calls with originator number information are stored in the RAM of the called station. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1 should be withdrawn and because claim 2-9 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-9 are allowable.

Claim 2 recites, in particular, "storing the calling party number...if the switching system of an intra-office is a single station." Kakutani does not teach or suggest this operation.

As noted above, Kakutani discloses a communication control system rather than a switching system. In addition, he does not disclose determining whether the switching system is intra-office or not, and the switching system is single station or not. Rather, Kakutani disclose storing the originator number, when included, and comparing between originator numbers and telephone number stored in telephone number registration memory 30. Therefore, Kakutani des

Serial No. 09/837,298 Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2004

not teach or suggest all the features in claim 2, and it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable.

Claim 4 recites, in particular, "storing a calling party number comprises requesting a calling party number from the origination processing unit if the requested call is an intra-office call..." Kakutani does not teach or suggest this operation.

Kakutani does not disclose differentiating between an intra-office and a non-intra-office call. Also, his communication control system does not request a calling party number to any unit. Rather, the communication control system just proceeds with a normal arrival response processing. Therefore, the rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 recites, in particular, storing a calling party number comprises requesting a calling party number from the incoming processing unit if the requested call is not an intra-office call..."Kakutani does not teach or suggest this operation.

As discussed above, Kakutani neither discloses distinguishing an intra-office call to a non-intra-office call nor requesting a calling party number especially to the incoming processing unit. He merely discloses a communication control system that continues to a normal arrival response processing. Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable.

Claim 10 recites, in particular, "storing the calling party number of an origination subscriber if the termination subscriber has registered for the calling party number call-back service..." Kakutani does not teach or suggest this operation.

Serial No. 09/837,298 Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2004

Kakutani, as described above, discloses an operation where if originator number information is present, the information is automatically stored in the RAM of the called station. However, he does not teach or suggest storing the calling party number of an origination subscriber if the termination subscriber has registered for the call-back service in the switching system. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable over Kakutani. Because claims 11-17 depend from claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 11-17 are allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 recites "comparing an area code of the calling party number informed by the origination processing unit and an area code of its own office if the switching system of the intra-office is a multi-station, and storing only the calling party number if the two area codes are identical to each other, or storing both the area code and the calling party number if the two area codes are different to each other."

Kakutani does not teach or suggest at all comparing an area code if the switching system of the intra-office is a multi-station. Rather, he discloses comparing the originator number information to the numbers in the telephone number memory 30 and proceeding to according modes. He does not disclose storing the number according to the difference in area codes. Accordingly, the rejection on claim 11 should be withdrawn.

Docket No. P-0215

Serial No. 09/837,298 Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2004

Claim 18 recites, in particular, "storing the terminated calling party number of an origination subscriber if the termination subscriber has registered for the calling party number call-back service in a database..." Kakutani does not teach or suggest this system.

As discussed in claim 10, Kakutani discloses an operation where if originator number information is present, the information is automatically stored in the RAM of the called station. However, he does not teach or suggest storing the calling party number of an origination subscriber if the termination subscriber has registered for the call-back service in the switching system. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is allowable over Kakutani. Because claims 19-20 depend from independent claim 10, they are allowable for at least the reason set forth in claim 18.

Docket No. P-0215

Serial No. 09/837,298 Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2004

CONCLUSIONIN view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Samuel W. Ntiros, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted, FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim

Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros

Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200 703-766-3701 DYK/SWN/JHK: cre

Date: June 22, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610